

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The previously filed Amendment is objected to as not being fully responsive to the prior Office Action because it fails to make drawing corrections required by the Examiner. While Applicant believes no drawing corrections are necessary and the claimed structures are clearly shown in the existing drawings, Applicant also believes that minor modifications to the specification will clearly identify those structures and clarify any confusion or misunderstanding the Examiner may have.

With respect to the data access head claimed in Applicant's claim 8, Applicant has amended the specification at page 15, line 4, to identify "stationary non-wetted surface 6" as being, for example, "a data access head." It is well known that in rotating disk memory systems, the disk rotates and the data access head is relatively stationary. Figure 3a illustrates the moving wetted surface 4 of the disk, moving in the direction of the horizontal arrow with the surface of the stationary data head indicated at 6. The lubricant 8 between the disk and head is also discussed in the specification.

Thus, Applicant's identification of the data access head being the stationary non-wetted surface 6 in Figure 3a and the data storage media (which the Examiner did not object to) as being the moving wetted surface 4 in Figure 3a, as well as the lubricant 8 therebetween, clearly illustrates all features discussed in claim 8.

Similarly, with respect to the objection that Applicant has not illustrated the electromechanical system of claim 10, Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to the specification at page 18, lines 9 and 10, in which Applicant discusses that Figures 7 and 8 illustrate an exemplary bearing for use in a micromachine such as a micromotor. As is well

known to those of ordinary skill in the art, a micromotor is an “electromechanical system.”

Applicant has amended the specification to confirm that the micromotor includes a rotor 20, thereby establishing that the discussion of the rotor 20 and the stator 19 relates to the bearing of a micromachine such as a micromotor, which is, by definition, an electromechanical system.

As a result of the above, Applicant still believes the originally submitted drawings are more than sufficient to illustrate the claimed structures, but Applicant has amended the specification to include descriptive terms taken from the claims where appropriate.

Applicant/Examiner Interview April 23, 2007

Applicant's undersigned representative contacted Examiner Footland on April 23, 2007 in order to discuss whether the above amendments meet the Examiner's requirement with respect to illustrating the “data access head” of claim 8 and the “electromechanical system of claim 10.” The Examiner was unable or unwilling to provide any opinion to Applicant's representative as to whether these amendments are sufficient to meet the illustration of the data access head and the electromechanical system. The Examiner would only indicate that Applicant could make these amendments and that he would then look at the issues anew. Applicant has thus made these amendments to the specification which are believed to clarify the structures which are already illustrated in Applicant's drawings and which are set out in Applicant's claims.

Having responded to all objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Official Action, it is submitted that claims 1-25, 27 and 28 are in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. In the event the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of these claims, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative.

SPIKES

Appl. No. 10/509,083

April 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____

Stanley C. Spooner
Reg. No. 27,393

SCS:kmm

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22203-1808

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100